

### REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on February 6, 2006, and the references cited therewith. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application, as amended.

Claims 1, 6, 8, and 16 have been amended. As a result the claim amendments, claims 1-24, as amended, are pending in the present patent application.

It is submitted that support for amended claims 1, 6, 8, and 16 is found in the application as originally filed. For example, paragraphs 26-28 of the present patent application describes how the location-assigning module to optimally allocate register locations in various memory blocks of a memory during compilation of a program code in accordance with proximity of program instructions (or code proximity) within the program code in accessing the register locations and a size of each of the memory blocks. It is thus submitted that amended claims 1, 6, 8, and 16 do not add new matter.

### '112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner stated in part that

- a. As per claim 1: in lines 3-4, the intended meaning of “in accordance with code proximity of the program code in accessing the register locations ...” is unclear. Applicant is requested to either clarify the meaning of the phrase or to amend the claim appropriately. See also claim 8, lines 3-4; and claim 16, lines 5-6.

(02/06/06 Office Action, page 2).

As stated above, claims 1, 8, and 16 have been amended to replace the term “code proximity of the program code” with “proximity of program instructions within the program code”. It is submitted that this amendment in each of claims 1, 8, and 16 overcomes the Examiner’s rejection under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

In addition, claim 6 has been amended to provide the proper antecedent basis for the "sorting result". Thus, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection to claim 6 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, has been overcome.

In view of the above-mentioned claim amendments, it is submitted that claims 1-24, as amended, overcome the Examiner's rejections under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (217-377-2500) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

LONG LI ET AL.

By their Representatives,

Customer No. 45512  
217-377-2500

Date May 3, 2006

By   
Lawrence M. Cho  
Reg. No. 39,942

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 3 day of May, 2006.

Shellie Bailey

  
Signature